


IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Norfolk Division



CENTRIPETAL NETWORKS, LLC,  
Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 2:21-CV-00137 (EWH)

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.,  
Defendant.

**VERDICT FORM**

In answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, you are to follow the jury instructions that I have given to you. Your answers to each of the questions must be unanimous.

In this verdict form, "Centripetal" or "Plaintiff" refer to Centripetal Networks, LLC. "Palo Alto Networks" or "Defendant" refer to Palo Alto Networks, Inc. In this verdict form, "the '437 Patent" refers to U.S. Patent No. 10,567,437; "the '903 Patent" refers to U.S. Patent No. 10,530,903; "the '573 Patent" refers to U.S. Patent No. 10,659,573; and "the '797 Patent" refers to U.S. Patent No. 10,931,797. In this verdict form, "Asserted Patents" means collectively the '437 Patent, '903 Patent, '573 Patent, and '797 Patent. In this verdict form, "Asserted Claims" means collectively Claim 8 of the '437 Patent; Claim 10 of the '903 Patent; Claims 1 and 9 of the '573 Patent; and Claims 1, 12, and 17 of the '797 Patent.

**I. INFRINGEMENT****Question No. 1 – Literal Infringement**

Did Centripetal prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Palo Alto Networks directly and literally infringed the following Asserted Claims?

Check “Yes” (infringed) or “No” (not infringed) in the corresponding field. *A “Yes” is a finding for Centripetal, a “No” is a finding for Palo Alto Networks.*

<b>'437 Patent: Claim 8</b>				
Next-Generation Firewalls combined with Panorama	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO

<b>'903 Patent: Claim 10</b>				
Next-Generation Firewalls that support the Automated Correlation Engine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO

<b>'573 Patent: Claim 1</b>				
Next-Generation Firewalls that support the Automated Correlation Engine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Next-Generation Firewalls without the Automated Correlation Engine combined with Cortex XDR and Cortex XSOAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Next-Generation Firewalls without the Automated Correlation Engine combined with Cortex XSIAM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO

<b>'573 Patent: Claim 9</b>				
Next-Generation Firewalls that support the Automated Correlation Engine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Next-Generation Firewalls without the Automated Correlation Engine combined with Cortex XDR and Cortex XSOAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Next-Generation Firewalls without the Automated Correlation Engine combined with Cortex XSIAM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO

— Continued on Next Page —

<b>'797 Patent: Claim 1</b>				
Next-Generation Firewalls that support the Automated Correlation Engine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Cortex XDR and Cortex XSOAR when combined	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Cortex XSIAM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
<b>'797 Patent: Claim 12</b>				
Next-Generation Firewalls that support the Automated Correlation Engine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
<b>'797 Patent: Claim 17</b>				
Cortex XDR and Cortex XSOAR when combined	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Cortex XSIAM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO

— Continued on Next Page —



**Question No. 2 – Induced Infringement**

Did Centripetal prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Palo Alto Networks indirectly infringed the following Asserted Claims by inducing its customers to infringe?

Check “Yes” (infringed) or “No” (not infringed) in the corresponding field. *A “Yes” is a finding for Centripetal, a “No” is a finding for Palo Alto Networks.*

<b>'573 Patent: Claim 1</b>				
Next-Generation Firewalls that support the Automated Correlation Engine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Next-Generation Firewalls without the Automated Correlation Engine combined with Cortex XDR and Cortex XSOAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Next-Generation Firewalls without the Automated Correlation Engine combined with Cortex XSIAM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO

<b>'797 Patent: Claim 1</b>				
Next-Generation Firewalls that support the Automated Correlation Engine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Cortex XDR and Cortex XSOAR when combined	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
Cortex XSIAM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO

**Question No. 3 – Doctrine of Equivalents**

Did Centripetal prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Palo Alto Networks infringed **Claim 8 of the '437 Patent** under the doctrine of equivalents?

Check “Yes” (infringed) or “No” (not infringed) in the corresponding field. *A “Yes” is a finding for Centripetal, a “No” is a finding for Palo Alto Networks.*

<b>'437 Patent: Claim 8</b>				
Next-Generation Firewalls combined with Panorama	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO

— Continued on Next Page —

**II. DAMAGES**

Answer the following questions only if you have found at least one Asserted Claim of that patent to be infringed.

**Question No. 4 – Damages**

What is the total amount that Centripetal has proven by a preponderance of the evidence it is entitled to receive from Palo Alto Networks as a reasonable royalty for Palo Alto Network's infringement?

'437 Patent	\$ <u>37,875,000</u>
'903 Patent	\$ <u>37,875,000</u>
'573 Patent	\$ <u>37,875,000</u>
'797 Patent	\$ <u>37,875,000</u>

If you have found that Centripetal is entitled to damages above (Question No. 4), are the damages based on a running royalty through trial or a lump sum royalty for the life of the Asserted Patents? (Select one)

☐ A running royalty through trial

☒ A lump sum royalty for the life of the Asserted Patents

— Continued on Next Page —

**Question No. 5 – Sales**

Does the reasonable royalty you found in response to Question 4 include a royalty for Palo Alto Networks' sales outside of the United States?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
-------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----

If you answered yes, of the total amount provided in response to Question 4, what part of that total is for sales in the United States and what part of that total is for sales outside the United States? The amounts listed below should equal the total amount provided in response to Question 4.

'437 Patent	Royalty for Sales to U.S. Customers: \$ <u>33,708,750</u> Royalty for Sales to non-U.S. Customers: \$ <u>4,166,250</u>
'903 Patent	Royalty for Sales to U.S. Customers: \$ <u>33,708,750</u> Royalty for Sales to non-U.S. Customers: \$ <u>4,166,250</u>
'573 Patent	Royalty for Sales to U.S. Customers: \$ <u>33,708,750</u> Royalty for Sales to non-U.S. Customers: \$ <u>4,166,250</u>
'797 Patent	Royalty for Sales to U.S. Customers: \$ <u>33,708,750</u> Royalty for Sales to non-U.S. Customers: \$ <u>4,166,250</u>

— Continued on Next Page —



**III. OTHER****Question No. 6 – Willful Infringement**

For each Asserted Patent, answer Question No. 6 ONLY if you have found at least one Asserted Claim of that patent to be infringed.

Did Centripetal prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Palo Alto Networks willfully infringed any of the Asserted Claims that you found were infringed?

Check “Yes” (willfully infringed) or “No” (not willfully infringed) in the corresponding field. A “Yes” is a finding for Centripetal, a “No” is a finding for Palo Alto Networks.

'437 Patent	<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
'903 Patent	<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
'573 Patent	<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
'797 Patent	<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO

**Question No. 7 – Well-Understood, Routine, and Conventional**

Did Palo Alto Networks prove by clear and convincing evidence that as to the following claims all the elements, when taken individually and as an ordered combination, involve only technology which a person of ordinary skill in the art would have considered well-understood, routine, and conventional as of the February 10, 2015 effective filing date of the '903, '573, and '797 Patents?

Check “Yes” (well-understood, routine, and conventional) or “No” (not well-understood, routine, and conventional) in the corresponding field. A “Yes” is a finding for Palo Alto Networks, a “No” is a finding for Centripetal.

'903 Patent: Claim 10	<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
'573 Patent: Claim 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
'573 Patent: Claim 9	<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
'797 Patent: Claim 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
'797 Patent: Claim 12	<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
'797 Patent: Claim 17	<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO

**SIGNATURE**

You have now reached the end of the verdict form and should review it to ensure it accurately reflects your **unanimous** determinations. The Foreperson should then sign and date the verdict form in the spaces below and notify the Court Security Officer that you have reached a verdict. The Foreperson should retain possession of the verdict form and bring it when the jury is brought back into the courtroom.

**PLEASE SIGN AND DATE THIS FORM ON THE LINES PROVIDED BELOW.**

1/31/2024  
Date

Foreperson

#10